

24895B

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

Claims 15-18 are pending in the instant application. Claims 15-18 stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Townsend (3,375,047).

The Examiner states that multi-strand rope constitutes texturized strand since the body of strands is twisted. The Examiner states that the rope/texturized strand of Townsend is coiled into a container in multiple layers, and removable lid is placed on the container.

Applicants have amend claims 15-17 to clarify that the texturized strand is a "texturized glass strand". No new matter has been added and support for the amendment can be found in the specification at page 2, lines 21-22 and at page 8, lines 8-12. Nowhere does Townsend teach or suggest "a glass strand disposed in said container in a texturized, coiled form, wherein said strand can be withdrawn from said container when said closure is removed" as Applicants claim. Further, on page 1, lines 29-33 (Applicants' specification), Applicants define "texturized strand" as "continuous strand that has been expanded or texturized. The fibers of the strand are expanded to give the strand a full, wool-like appearance." Townsend specifically teaches a container for rope lariats or lassoes and not a "texturized glass strand", as Applicants claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

24895B

Rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis (3,968,877) in view of Mackie et al. (4,159,297). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious in view of Mackie et al. to have made the crimp of the two of Mattis as a coiled crimp to the two easier to handle or give the two more body.

As stated above, Applicants have amended claims 15-17 to clarify that the texturized strand is a "texturized glass strand". Mattis teaches a package for the storage of "crimped" acrylic tow, specifically, a "herringbone crimp" (col. 6, line 28). Mackie et al. teach producing crimped filaments of polyolefin or blends of polyolefins. Neither Mattis nor Mackie et al. teach a "texturized glass strand" as Applicants claim. There is no mention of glass fibers in either Mattis or Mackie et al. Further, Mattis and Mackie et al. teach "crimped" fibers and not "texturized" strand as Applicants claim. The term "crimp" is defined as "to press or pinch into small folds or ridges" (*American Heritage Dictionary*, Third Edition, 1994, Houghton-Mifflin Company). On page 1, lines 29-33 (specification), Applicants define "texturized strand" as "continuous strand that has been expanded or texturized. The fibers of the strand are expanded to give the strand a full, wool-like appearance." As indicated from the definitions, the terms "crimp" and "texturized" are clearly distinct.

Neither Mackie et al. nor Mattis individually nor the combination of Mackie et al. and Mattis teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations including a "texturized glass strand". Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 103(a) rejection of claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 18 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis and Mackie et al. further in view of Galanes (3,670,949).

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious in view of Galanes to have made the carton of Mattis, as modified above, of corrugated cardboard to give the carton strength.

24895B

Claim 18 depends from claim 15 and contains the limitations thereof. As stated above, neither Mackie et al. nor Mattis teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations including a "texturized glass strand". As such, it would not have been obvious in view of Galanes to have made the carton of Mattis, as modified above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 103(a) rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned agent at (740) 321-7213 if any unresolved matters remain.

If any questions should arise with respect to the above Remarks, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions to place the claims in better condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' agent at the number listed below.

Applicant authorizes any fees required pertaining to this response be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0568.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Maria C. Gasaway
Maria C. Gasaway
Reg. No. 51,721

Date: February 4, 2003

Owens Corning
2790 Columbus Road, Bldg. 54
Granville, OH 43023
(740) 321-7213